

REMARKS

I. PRELIMINARIES

Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein for clarity. Claims 19 and 20 have been added. Hence, claims 1, 4, 7 – 9, 10, 13, 16 – 18, 19 & 20 are pending in the Application. No new matter is added herein.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

Claims 1, 4, 7 – 9, 10, 13, 16 – 18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014394 to Fujiwara, et al. (hereinafter Fujiwara) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,552 to Lei et al. (hereinafter Lei). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 & 10

Claim 1 requires “registering with a database server a user defined policy function to associate with at least **two columns of two tables**,” and “metadata that associates said policy function with said at least **two columns of two tables**.” Importantly, claims 1 and 10 do not just require associating a policy function with a single column with a single table, but a policy function with **two columns of two tables**.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP 2143

The Examiner has alleged that cited art teaches to register with a database server a user defined policy function supplied by a user. (Office Action, page 3, 3rd paragraph) The Examiner

has also alleged that Lei teaches the registering causing said database server to generate database metadata that associates with said policy function. (page 4, 3rd paragraph) However, in making these allegations, the Examiner has failed to allege the cited art teaches registering and generating metadata to associate a policy function with **two columns from two tables**, as claimed, and has thus failed to allege a prima facie case of obviousness.

Because the Examiner has failed to even allege a prima facie case of obviousness, claims 1 and 10 have not been properly rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 10 is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant believes that a Notice of Allowance is thus next in order and most earnestly requests formal issuance of same. The Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or other convenient medium relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

Applicant believes this reply to be timely. Nevertheless, Applicant hereby petitions provisionally for any extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. Throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: October 8, 2007

/MarcelKBingham#42327/
Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110